

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 19

We are now into August and the pay offer has still not been agreed and with inflation now running at 4 per cent, the 3.75% offer for this year is in effect a pay cut in real terms. Why does the pay offer not comprise of the inflation figure at 1 April each year plus an additional 1%, that way it would save on prolonged negotiations.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 20

In my time in the service of Scotland... over the last 19 years, we have mostly had less than inflation pay rises. This means that not only has our pay, effectively, reduced in real terms - but our pension has similarly lowered.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 20 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] - our pension benefit is still a way lot better than most outside of the public sector. In the private sector, lots of private sector employers are putting in the minimum 3% into the defined contribution pot when a defined benefit pension would require about 15%.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 20 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Yes, I agree with you. It is! Having said that (and I shall be retiring soon), but it is disheartening to know that in real terms, my pension will not be as good as someone at the same grade as me who retired 20 years ago. One year, a retired colleague called in at the workplace, and jokingly asked "Did you enjoy your 1% pay rise? - As I thoroughly am enjoying my 3%" noting that the pension he was receiving went up by a cost of living figure. On the other hand' I am glad, that at this time of life, I had the opportunity to spend 30 years in state sector pension schemes. (Some here, and some in Education).

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 20 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Never a truer word spoken. The provision of an employer backed defined benefit scheme is very, very expensive - prohibitively so. As someone who has been on the receiving end of the demise of a private sector defined benefit scheme (which follows a pattern to become affordable: employer contributions rise; employee contributions rise; future accrual is less generous; and finally scheme closure) I can confirm that our pension benefit is still a way lot better than most outside of the public sector.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 22

Our pensions shouldn't be used as a rationale for lower pay - especially as they are linked to that pay. I also am deeply aware of the huge differences in pensions reality for many current and civil servants purely based on age or start date - not to mention that our current 'very good' pensions are poor compared to the final salary pensions of the recent past.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 5 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Surely that's a bit of a red herring? Yes our pension is better than the rush to the bottom other sectors have experienced. I'm delighted that I will shortly be able to take advantage of the MacLeod Judgement and

intend to take partial retirement to tide me over to 67. However, the pension contribution has always been part of the overall package. Civil Servants have always had lower take home pay than those outside, as the pension contributions have always been considered as part of your overall compensation. As pay awards fall below inflation so do the contributions to the final salary scheme. It means your final pension reduces in real terms. My biggest regret in the 40 years of being a civil servant is just how undervalued and poorly treated we all have been over the years by those we serve. I am glad I am retiring shortly. But I feel heartbroken for all those young people who are just starting out in the Service, who undoubtedly will work for longer and get even less in retirement - Even more so than I will compared to those retiring when I started work back in 1985.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 8 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] It's always the same argument: others having it worse than us doesn't make it ok for us to have it bad. This isn't a race to the bottom and we shouldn't stop fighting for better things just because "it could always be worse".

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 8 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] It's not that long ago that many private sector schemes were considerably more generous than the current Civil Service offering. My late father's pension with Aviva (which started at General Accident many years prior) was non-contributory, gave a generous tax-free lump sum on retirement, paid him near enough the same as he received when working, and when he died mum received a spouse pension at 75% the value.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 20

i honestly do not understand why those above think its acceptable to delay this every time. They know when the deals ends and should plan and communicate accordingly. Someone, somewhere has this in their objectives. selling it to us as all monies will be backdated is all very well and good but some people need it for the here and now. Our own staff are using food banks and not just on the odd occasion. a despicable way to treat people if you ask me. We should not be chasing for updates and better communication - that should be a given.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 22

Well said [Redacted S.38(1)(b)]. Is it my imagination or do pay rise negotiations only start in April? Why are these negotiations not starting months before that so there is more of a chance of securing a deal BEFORE the pay rise is actually meant to kick in. Last year it took until October to get things in place, and it's all very well being advised that the all relevant money is backdated but that means that when an extra lump sum like that lands in our accounts we get hit for tax!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 22

I really do not see the correlation between the repeated lateness of a pay rise being agreed and the fact that Scottish Government pension is a very generous one, which nobody, I think, would deny. The two things are entirely separate. A pay rise is in the here-and-now. If somebody is relying on a pay rise and relying on it being paid in timely fashion, what relevance is there to commenting that the Scottish Government pension is "still a way lot better than most outside of the public sector". That's not going to solve the pressing problem of pay rise problems in the present.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 22

I've no idea why it takes so long. It's an institutional failure, but which institution, I prefer not to speculate. On inflation it's not just the average weighted inflation rate, but the specifics of what you might be spending money on. For example if you look at the price of rental in Edinburgh or house prices (which will be reflected in the monthly mortgage repayment), you can see where much of any pay rise will be going. In addition there appear to be all sorts of taxes looming on the horizon. It would be nice to think that the delay was based on something rational, such as waiting to see how the autumn tax changes go...but since this happens every year, I'm not so sure about that. As I don't want to sound like doom and gloom, let me just say that the Scottish Government is a great place to work for all sorts of reasons. But that doesn't mean I'm happy about this delay.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 22

Part of the issue is that the pay offer is not simply about salaries, but also covers wider working conditions. Previous year's delays have often been due, in part, to negotiating things like a four-day working week, which has so far delivered a 35 hour week, alongside pay rises. This year, for example, the pay offer is also intending to introduce an update to the no compulsory redundancy policy.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 22 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] It appears to be a watering down of the no compulsory redundancy policy such that it become a policy where compulsory redundancies are allowed if Ministers feel they're needed, which most certainly is not an actual policy of no compulsory redundancies.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 27 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Agree totally however a 35 hour working week doesn't pay the monthly bills and another energy price increase looms on the horizon.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 25

I know it's completely impractical but it would be good if the money available for any pay offer could be targeted on those who most need it. I'm at the top of the C1 scale and I couldn't complain if I never got another pay rise, taking account of our working hours; pensions; holidays, that we're paid far better than other UK civil servants; and, above

all, that we're living in a country with significant levels of poverty and low pay, and we're an organisation that is supposed to be committed to equality.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] presumably that's predicated on your out-goings not going up either? I don't disagree with the non-pay benefits but they don't help balance out increases in mortgages/rent, council tax, energy, food etc. Salaries may be higher but out-goings are often based on that and just because people are receiving higher wages doesn't mean they have disposable income to lose by not getting a pay rise.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Having spent 8 years in a UK Government department getting further away from, rather than closer to, my pay grade maximum I'm not sure if pay levels following over a decade of austerity should be the barometer for whether our own pay is sufficient or not at any grade.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 26 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] totally agree! Whilst on the face of it top of the C1 band is a good salary, it isn't if you need to factor in continual mortgage increases (including jumps of £400 or more a month when you come to re-mortgage) plus food bills rising and if you have childcare expenses (which are often the same or higher than a mortgage payment) it really means you can be left with little to no disposable income a month and struggling to service the bills you do have which seems crazy. The only way round this is moving out of cities where house prices are more affordable but then with office attendance likely increasing this isn't realistic either. I can only assume those that are content have more reasonable fixed outgoings.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 26 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] well said - not to mention rising energy bills and council tax too! It's a nightmare. In real terms we are consistently worse off than our counterparts years ago.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Just to add some analysis to this. I've posted it a good few times in different places, but as of June 25 you can see that against our 2008 wages, those at the top of the C1 banding are £22,216 short of where they would be had wages kept up with inflation from 2008 (when the pay freezes were introduced). That is a pretty significant number missing from wages. It is always important to note that terms and conditions should never be compared downward. That will never serve to improve things. Instead, we should be looking at areas with better terms, like RoS for example, and using them as a yardstick.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Thanks, I have seen this and it is really useful and important to keep sharing. I hope that the unions are well aware of this information too!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I couldn't agree more with your comments [Redacted S.38(1)(b)], anyone on the max of a C1 salary is earning significantly more than the average salary in Scotland. People should remember that we are working in the service of Scotland and be grateful for our pay and conditions which are far superior to the majority of our fellow countrypeople.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I can agree with you in one sense -- but not in the other: that approach is a recipe for pay compression, which removes development possibilities and doesn't leave scope for future evolution. So, appealing in terms of individual morality, if one has the possibility, but not appealing in terms of a system-wide approach.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I wholly disagree with this assessment. Yes, people on the max of C1 (and above) are earning more than the average in Scotland, but that's no reason to simply accept whatever is in your wage packet. We do serve the people of Scotland, but let's be honest – the Civil Service is often badly regarded, especially in the media. We're told we're inefficient and too big, while at the same time being told the work we do is never enough. That's not an easy environment to work in. Civil servants are highly skilled, professional people, and we should value ourselves as such. We deserve a fair wage – certainly not one that's been cut in real terms once inflation is taken into account. Everyone has bills to pay, and circumstances vary. Someone on the "average" wage in Cowdenbeath may be as comfortable as someone on C1 max in Edinburgh. But that only highlights the issue: the average Scottish wage is already too low, and using it as a comparator just locks in stagnation. We should never look downwards when setting expectations. We can be grateful for our terms and conditions while still recognising that we deserve better. I always try to remember that pay deals impact everyone – from A3s still living at home to C3s providing for a family on a single income. It's never as simple as "that's objectively a good wage", and we shouldn't frame it that way.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] You have just advocated for a self-imposed pay ceiling for everyone below C1.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I know stereotypes exist for a reason - but A3s come in all ages, from bright young things beginning a career 'in the service of Scotland' to 60 year old people who have not had the same life opportunities; be they education, networks, or just the luck of the draw, or rub of the green. There is diversity in all strata of the Organisation.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Apologies if my earlier post read as though I was drawing lines between grades or types of staff – that wasn't my intention. My point was simply that, when thinking about a pay deal, I consider everyone across

the organisation. Whether it's bright young A3s or 60-year-old A3s, they all deserve a fair, above-inflation settlement. And the same goes for those on C1 max.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 8 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Absolutely - and your Figure highlights the real term drop in earnings for everyone since 2008. As I have remarked in other places on Viva Engage, it also means that people who retired on a particular pay grade in 2008 (who will also have had 'cost of living' increases to their pensions) will be much better off than someone retiring more recently at the same pay grade.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 25

Has anyone had any substantive update on pay since the announcement on 24 July? I've attended union meetings but we seem no further forward.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I fear that it will be October again (hopefully no later than that). Maybe if we prod the union and management bods early enough, perhaps next year's pay rise will in our banks much, much sooner!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 26

I believe that if a pay settlement is delayed we should be paid interest on any delayed payments as we could have earned interest on this money if we had been paid on time. If this occurred it might encourage pay rises to be agreed more promptly.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 27

Maybe they should l move implementation date of any pay changes to give more time to reach an agreement.....Oh wait a minute, they did.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 9 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] sure did. For those that can remember, they moved it to October (disadvantaging staff) a number of years back to allow the negotiations to be held and pay awarded on time (except it seldom was, and was often awarded in March the following year - which left it quite tight when it came to financial planning for year ahead). Most will recall them moving this back to April a few years ago on the hope that this would reduce delays.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 27

The transcript of the ASK ET session includes a statement that the pay increase can't be implemented without the agreement of the unions but if memory serves me correctly, a few years ago we got the pay increase before any agreement was reached and few people would object to getting the original offer added automatically at the 1st of April.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 27 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] The original offer may not be better than what it progresses to, as is the case this year, and we might be left with thousands of people needing to pay back overpayments. That said, agreeing that progression should be applied regardless of pay agreements would be a great step.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 27

Do you mean that our pay award can be less than that originally proposed after the union negotiations?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 27 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] you are correct. They have implemented a pay increase without the unions support before. I think the way in which this has been handled and now effectively blaming the unions for the delay is a very poor show indeed.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 27 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] The proposed pay award is already less than what was originally discussed with the unions...

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 27 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Pay progress is not a contractual requirement and forms part of the pay negotiations, according to our employer...

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 27 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I thought the pay progress was linked to the performance for those not at the top of the band so if anything progress should be automatic after the year-end appraisal is completed.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 27 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Pay Progression is not an automatic mechanism, it requires to be agreed and negotiated in pay deals as to whether or not it happens.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 27 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I'm aware Pay Progression isn't an automatic mechanism. I was suggesting that it could be negotiated as an automatic thing to reduce the impact on staff below their max (in the same way that a reduction of our working hours was negotiated as an ongoing condition).

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 28 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I think unions are, and have been for some time, trying to get automatic pay progression. I've heard union reps say that they believe pay progression is contractual, therefore should be automatic. However the employer believes it is not contractual. Automatic pay progression would ease the impact on staff below their max, however, that would also weaken the employer's bargaining position in pay negotiations. By holding back on pay progression until an agreement is reached, staff who are feeling the pinch are more likely to accept the first offer on the table.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I previously worked for the land registry, Registers of Scotland, and their pay structure was one with fewer jumps between the minimum and maximum, yearly (based on your start date in the role) and automatic pay progression, and all round higher wages (marginally, but higher none the less) across the board. In addition to that, staff are given a year's parental/maternity at full pay. RoS are now under the Scottish Government umbrella, I am sure, which seems lopsided - one agency of SG gives its staff the above whilst SG itself doesn't.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I hope the existing RoS employees got to retain those terms and conditions when they came under the SG umbrella

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Yeah they did, it was a good few years ago now, I was still there - but have been told recently things remain the same.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] it's strange that it's not part of the system and can change every year!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 9 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I think it was Ministers who imposed the pay award last time and not the ET. So, the transcript is actually factually correct.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 27

That's far too sensible [Redacted S.38(1)(b)]. What would all the people do who've got a job negotiating pay deals 😊

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4

I hope I am not being overly cynical but the latest communication (dated the 3rd of this month) concerning the pay rise states (my italics), "Staff were informed on 24 July 2025 that SG had put a formal three-year pay offer to the recognised trade unions for A-C band colleagues in the SG Main Bargaining Unit. The offer was rejected by the trade unions. The Scottish Government and trade unions are now arranging further discussions to try and achieve a resolution". If further discussions are NOW being arranged, that begs the question when precisely was the last time discussions were held? As I mentioned in a previous comment, last year all this wasn't sorted until October but if memory serves, on that occasion we were actually aware a good few weeks before that that it was going to be October. The present timetable suggests that it may not even be October this year, but as I say, maybe I'm letting cynicism get the better of me.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I don't know all the ins and outs but I am pretty sure our union rep mentioned "coming back to the table" which does imply that at some point parties walked away from negotiations. Possibly around the same time that the unions declined the SG offer and PCS took their membership to a ballot (which was an escalation)...While I do want our pay offer through, this implies to me that the unions are working hard on our behalf to secure a good deal or at least a fair one. I'm hopeful that is the ultimate outcome but yes, it is taking a long time this year.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I've been involved in pay talks in the private sector with another Union and nothing is done quickly. Based on my experience (and not in Government), pay talks can easily go on for months without any real progress. And unfortunately, content of those talks will be embargoed. There are a lot of different reasons for it, some are circumstantial and others are deliberate, which is

designed to squeeze members into saying Yes to inferior deals because many lower paid members will be struggling. Ultimately, patience in these things will be rewarded. If you give an inch now, a mile will be taken later, and then it will be extremely difficult to reclaim ground long term. You never want to be in a situation where you're are being paid less each year in real terms - who wants that? As for timelines, if discussions are in September, those discussions may roll into October, it really depends on the diaries of the main negotiators, what the red lines are for both sides and how much of an appetite the Gov have to increase the offer (and if they are moving by fractions or whole %s). Even if they walked out with an agreement in September, by the time the members have balloted, and assuming it was a Yes vote, depending on when payroll needed to be notified, you are probably looking at November. If those discussions prolong, the vote is No, or even Industrial Action is balloted, you're are getting into next year.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 5

Hi [Redacted S.38(1)(b)], very informative. I have to put my hands up and admit that I am unfamiliar with the workings of pay negotiations. I don't know if you could help, but I have been with the Scottish Government for almost eighteen years. It seems to be only in recent years that there has been a delay in pay rises being awarded hence the need for pay rises to be backdated. It used to be the case that pay rises were always paid on time. Maybe this was just coincidental.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 5 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I can only speak of my experience in the private sector as I'm not a Union Rep here, but it seemed very much an overall trend by business to delay. Having a pay rise is not a guarantee, nor is implementing one. However, we do have strong a Union presence, so we should expect constructive discussions and and hopefully a positive outcome. The problem is that you have 2 pressures. The Trade Union/s want to give members at the very least, an inflation pay rise so your job role isn't devalued. Ideally, you want to achieve better than inflation or negotiate some better terms (more holiday, 4 day week) which you might trade some of that pay rise for. The Business side will complain about needing to be profitable, being sustainable, keeping investors/shareholders happy, or if privately owned, the owner will want his big pay day. So there is a need to cut costs, be more efficient, and race to the bottom in terms of operational costs at the expense of the employee "working more for less". In the public sector, we are still constrained to tight budgets, and our shareholders are effectively the public who will have an opinion on how much we are paid. But the drivers will probably be similar that the TUs want pay to keep up with the economy and the Business want to keep operating costs to a minimum.

Staff costs are usually one if not the biggest item on the balance sheet and the most tempting to hack at. And I believe that staff costs have significantly increased because of the change in NI contributions for employers. The last pay talks I was present at in the private sector, the offer was around 1% with the excuse that inflation was only going to

be 2% (the Gov target), and we were challenged on whether we were really prepared to die on the hill for an extra 1%. Now roll on a few months (summer holidays got in the way, re-orgs, redundancy strategy and other delays), pay talks finally restarted and after a "NO" from the Unions, we got an increase to the offer of an additional 0.25%. Now eventually, with a lot of to and fro, that 1.25% became 2% which we knew they were prepared to pay but we had to fight them for it. Trouble is, at 2%, we still haven't hit current inflation. Then you are in a crystal ball moment where the business will not budge as they are adamant they don't want to pay above the expected inflation, while the TUs will argue that 2% isn't going to happen. There you hit a stale mate and sometimes you need to wait for the next budget, or the next confidence report from the Banks/markets to see where things are going to swing in the future. So I think its a case of, a change in tactics generally for negotiations coupled with a very volatile economy and a very uncertain world politics situation, i.e. Trump tariff war, Ukraine/Russia, Israel/Middle East conflicts, which could at a moment notice drive the world, or parts of it, into economic downturns impacting inflation one way or the other. But I think as it stands, the pay offer looks to be lower than inflation and over a 3 year deal with a lot of uncertainty, it would be a huge gamble for members to accept the current terms, which could leave everyone much poorer.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4

Agree, a formula would save a lot of annual negotiations and also help everyone, including our employer, to plan.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] no employer would ever agree to a formula and be held accountable to it. It provides no financial flexibility and could lead to job losses if the formula was too expensive to implement and the economy broke. It also gives no where to go to negotiate on other T&Cs. So for example, if you want to argue a 4 day week, what will the TUs concede to get that deal? There's nothing to bargain with, where if you wrap that within the pay negotiations, you could accept a smaller pay rise for the additional reduction in working time. Both sides can claim a win in that case.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 4 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Other areas of the public sector have agreed to pay deals with CPI and RPI inflation commitments and/or re-opener clauses.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 5 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] On this note, I think I would be interested in the union's stance on whether they intend to negotiate for everything that was proposed in the pay proposal in isolation, or in context of the other factors. I personally would accept a lower pay rise if it meant a 4 day week, but unless I missed it, I don't believe that has been balloted to find out where members stand. Though that depends if 4 day week is even on the table of course, I suspect not.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 5 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] They recently said that the 4 day week is off the table.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 5 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I wasn't sure if I had imagined that or it had actually happened, thank you for the confirmation, sad as it makes me!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 8

Scottish Government: Minister rules out four-day week despite pilot finding productivity and wellbeing benefits

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 8 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I wish I could understand rationale behind deciding against evidence, but I suspect if I did I would just be more sad.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 9 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I've worked in places where there is such an approach, and employers do agree to it.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 9

Of course -- like any contract -- you can have an emergency clause in case of some definition of 'the economy has broken' -- but that should also be empirically testable, not vague. And yes, such contracts do exist.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 10 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Yes agree we should have an inflation indicator in place for a multi year deal, but to clarify, no employer would agree a permanent inflation indicator on pay that somehow became enshrined contractually. It would always have to be attached and agreed (if possible) for each pay deal negotiated. Unless of course you always go for 1 year pay deals, which was the tactic we generally used in the private sector. Multi year pay deals were great years ago when things didn't move much from the status quo, but market volatility seems to be more rife these days (or it seems that way).

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 10 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I can't answer that question as I'm not a Union Rep within Scottish Government. I was only talking of previous experience in the private sector and with a Union that isn't involved in the current pay talks here. If the pay talks have gone the same way here as when I did them in the private sector, the pay claim from the Unions is usually a shopping list of items. In the private sector, we always included a 4 day week (or really a reduction of hours with no loss of pay) and an increase in annual leave. We'd also include small ticket / quick wins, for example, an increase in "working from home payment", because in the main, we were contractual home workers, or for our members out on the road, a coffee card with a budget to get a drink. Working from home payments are clearly not applicable here in the Scottish Government, but it gives you an idea that the pay claim doesn't have to be just about a pay rise, it can include a number of other benefits members may be interested in. If you are in the Union, it's always worth sharing ideas for things you're interested in. One thing I was always passionate about was giving parents taking a year off for maternity, up to a

full year's pay. At a time when you really need full wages and preparing to return to work (child care), the last thing you want is be a few months on reduced pay eating any savings you might have. But generally speaking, if you have a shopping list and you're not making headway on something, you can start to look more closely at the other items. As an example, in my previous employ we were offered an additional £100 discount if we took up the companies product/services. Which might sound great, but when you balance £100 a year if you use their product/services verses a 1% additional pay rise for life, you might feel a little disappointed. Certainly the members I represented were furious at the concept of being given £100 to effectively give it back to the company. They'd rather just have the £100 lol.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 3 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] and yet -- they do agree such deals. Presumably the savings in time and resource of not needing to renegotiate every six months/year is meaningful to the employers who do.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 3 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] totally agree it's about the 'whole package' -- but I get quite peeved when the (formerly) edenred business is considered a 'perk' -- no, it's just a way to spend money. Maybe a shade less money than I might otherwise have spent, but it won't pay the gas/electric/mortgage/rent; and if I can avoid spending money on the sorts of things it covers, then I am both (a) frugal and (2) out of a 'benefit'.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 3 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] it is also clunky and difficult to use. I don't want to have to prepay a card to save 3% on my grocery shopping.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 10

haha i see you are new to this game

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Sep 16

Another unfair impact of drawn-out pay negotiations and the resulting delay is on pension contributions. If you're close to a contributions threshold, backdated pay can trigger pension deductions at the next tier in the month its paid - even if your overall annual pay remains within the lower band. So for many, backdated pay (plus the pay for that month) is actually scalped by 1-2 percent.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)], this hasn't been the case since September 2020. 5.3 Contributions - Civil Service Pension Scheme

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 2

Is there anyone from the Union who are in talks with SG have any updates on the talks, i am aware its will be 4 weeks tomorrow since the last update that talks were resuming?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 2

Hi [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] - At a Union meeting last week we were told that it seemed an agreement has been reached and that the union expected to be in a position to make an announcement within three weeks. So fingers crossed we should hear something in the next two weeks.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 3 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Thank you for the update, i assume there was no indication as to what the offer was no? least its something, the fact its October and its taken this long is frankly not good.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 3 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] that's right, they were not able to give an indication. I agree that the time taken is frustrating. However, my personal view is that if it means we get a fair deal then it is worth it. Our salaries have eroded in real terms year on year and the odds of us catching up to where they were are slim. Let's hope we are at least keeping pace with inflation!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 3 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] absolutely agree if it means getting the best possible deal

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 3

Wonder why it is going to take 3 weeks to make an announcement. If agreement has been reached then tell us what it is.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 3

Will we be balloted on the deal or do you think it'll just be accepted if the Union isn't so far saying anything negative?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 3 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] update yesterday to say there will be an announcement next week. It sounds as though a deal has been reached but I don't know that for sure. Our union rep said the three weeks is because post negotiations there are several levels of sign off that have to happen and they aren't able to say anything until those processes have taken place

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 3 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] sounds positive, thank you again
[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 6

Saltire has been updated: Pay ranges and pay award

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Your link is denied to those of us who work in agencies & although Saltire says it was updated 6 Oct 2025 it appears to still be showing the details of the 3 year offer.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] an all staff e-mail has been issued which contains a copy of the pay offer document. As the e-mail explains, there is a process of agency Saltire pages syncing with the SG Core Saltire pages. That should be

resolved in the next hour. In the meantime, the full details of the pay offer are available in the attachment to the all staff e-mail.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 6

I welcome the improved pay offer but I am disappointed to see that even if unions agree and the pay deal goes ahead this will not be processed in salaries until end-Dec. I appreciate it must be quite a task to update all staff salaries but we have known since 1 April that this would need done. End-Nov salaries would have enabled people to have access to their earnings before Christmas (remembering we have already worked for and are entitled to this pay since 1 April).

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 6

Many thanks. All staff email has now arrived

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 6

This shareable link will work for all SG Main and agencies to view the pay content.
[internal link]

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 7

End of December payment - what a cruel thing to do to people, especially for those with young families heading into Christmas who may already be struggling to pay the bills.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 7 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] agree, it's always been in before Christmas before which has been a big help!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 7

I thoroughly agree that it's deeply disappointing that we won't be receiving our back pay until after Christmas. Dragging this out as long as it has been has felt rather miserly at the best of times, and that really cements the impression.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 7 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Very much hoping it's a case of HR being overly cautious with this being the first pay deal applied onto the Oracle system, and will apply it to end of November salaries instead if things go smoothly.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 8 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Ah the old under-promise and over-deliver tactic. I really hope so.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 8

It could also be that HR are waiting on the unions completing their consultations and voting and can't finalise the pay offer on the payroll system until the unions action is done and dusted.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 3

Update on Pay Discussions? Does anyone know if there has been any update in regards to the pay discussions and when this will be finalised? Last communication to staff seemed to be 24th July - August & September are now passed and still no word of current situation.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 3

There was this on 3 September: Leadership brief A-C pay award discussions to resume The Scottish Government put forward a three-year pay offer for A-C band colleagues in the SG main bargaining unit, but this was rejected by the recognised trade unions in July. The Scottish Government and trade unions are now arranging further discussions to try and achieve a resolution. Managers are asked to cascade this message to colleagues working at A-C bands. A further update will be shared in due course. Senior Civil Service (SCS) pay award 2025 The SCS pay award will be processed with end-September salaries, backdated to the effective date of 1 April 2025. Staff who joined or moved within SCS after 1 April will receive pro-rated arrears of pay. Key elements include: 3.25% consolidated increase for all SCS in post on 1 April 2025 additional consolidated increases for eligible staff below target rates SCS pay is separate to pay for colleagues working in bands A-C in the SG main bargaining unit. SCS pay is reserved to the UK Government and managed by Cabinet Office. Cabinet Office confirmed the terms of the SCS pay award in July, which we are now putting into practice.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 3

Someone on this thread has said that an announcement is expected next week [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] on Viva Engage: We are now into August and the pay offer has still not been agreed and with inflation now running at 4 per cent, the 3.75% offer for this year is in e... Posted in All Company on Aug 19, 2025

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 23

Was wondering what is happening with the Pay Award for 2025, there hasn't been any updates and we are now 4 months into what should be the new pay agreement.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 23

This came from PCS: "Your branches will be setting up pay meetings for late next week or early week commencing 28th July, as SG have made clear their intention to announce their final pay offer next week. We have been prohibited from telling members what is in the offer, but the GEC have discussed it and are of a unanimous view. The outcome of that discussion along with briefing and FAQ will be communicated via email to all members as soon as the offer is published."

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 23

Just got this from PCS - PCS are aware that a premature announcement of the pay offer was inadvertently made by management to a group of staff this morning. To reassure you, full comms from PCS on pay will be released as soon as the official announcement is made, as per the terms of the embargo put in place by the employer. We anticipate this will be tomorrow, Thursday 24th July.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] wonder how many like me opened it up hoping that was announcement there lol

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

Pay deal up on Saltire [internal link]

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] weird, getting access denied too, authorisation error looks like despite the email being my main SS one

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Derisory. Another real terms pay cut, unprotected against future inflation in an increasingly unstable economic climate, where costs are consistently rising at a much faster rate than 3% p/a. Not to mention that this is a worse offer than most other public sector workers have received.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I think they are updating the site. When you go in through the homepage, the section on pay ranges has disappeared

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] What's included in the offer
Increases to the value of all pay steps in bands A to C: 1 April 2025 – 3.75% 1 April 2026 – 3.25% 1 April 2027 – 2% pay progression for colleagues on a pay step below the maximum for their pay range continued commitment to no compulsory redundancies
The unions have not agreed to this offer. Which I personally find derisory. cc: [Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Honestly, what I was expecting, I'm not sure what more evidence we need to indicate how little value they put on us. Hopefully unions push back, but given how they capitulated on the last award I shan't hold my breath

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] try [internal link]

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

So in each of 25/26 AND 26/27 SG are wanting to pay its civil servants 0.5% less than NHS Agenda for Change staff and 0.25% less than local authority employed staff (inc council workers, teachers etc). In addition, they're not prepared to give us an inflation proofed deal like the NHS AfC staff have been given AND are imposing a 40% (inevitably eventually turning to 60%) return to the office which will have consequential cost increases for many of us, and which is both unevidenced and severely lacked proper due engagement and consultation before the decision was taken. With respect to 27/28, 2% might look ok if inflation was running lower than that, but no one knows where inflation will be in that time, and in an increasingly febrile global situation, inflation could continue to remain stubbornly high or receive conflict and climate triggered shocks. I'm behind the unions in rejecting this.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Aren't we already paid more than both those cohorts you mention ? On a like for like comparable job family/role ?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Depends on which grade you are. We have A3s using food banks. Also "their pay is bad so ours should be worse" helps no one. It's a race to the top, not the bottom!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] But you'd agree that the pay package received for these grades is generally in line, if not above, the industry standard for the type of work undertaken ? For example, a contact centre agent in the private market receives NMW. This pay award would put A3's (your example) around 18% higher than the industry (assuming NMW) at the bottom of the pay scale. I do agree its horrific that the cost of living crisis and generally the economy in the UK means people are turning to food banks and I don't disagree with your sentiment here, but I think there is a balance to be struck and on the face of it this offer feels like a good balance.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] me too - I'm in an agency, so I think it's because there are different versions of Saltire for different groups.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

Draw your own conclusions.... 🤔

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 30 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Wanted to make people aware of the fact we have been told we would work toward pay restoration against 2008 wages. Table one (picture one) shows you (if you are on the top of your band) how much you are down respective to where your wages should be if they had continued at the rate we were given in 2008. Table two (picture two) shows you where your wages would be with this new offer - only for the first increase being offered, 3.75%. Please note - this is against inflation to June 25 - given we are almost in August, it is nearly out of date so will

change, and in fact by the time we make any decisions on this offer, it is likely that inflation will outstrip the offer.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 11 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] have you sent these tables to the union(s)? I am sure they are aware but continuing to raise awareness is no bad thing.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

Pay ranges and pay award - see if this works

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

Pay ranges and pay award - see if this works

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

Anyone else think the unions may advise to reject this?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Believe so, it feels like there needs to be something to sweeten the deal to me

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Abandon the imposition to return to the office 40% and then 60%.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] PCS and Prospect have advised that they reject the terms of this pay offer and they will contact members about next steps in due course. The FDA has not formally rejected the offer at this stage but has indicated that it cannot recommend its members accept it.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

Might be an opportunity to revisit the 4 day working week as a sweetener

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

The NHS got 8% over 2 years. So 9% for us over 3 is a huge let down. Considering the cost of housing in Glasgow has gone up by over 100% in the last 10 years. Also 2% for year 3 is a hell of a bet the uk economy isn't gonna tank again in the next 3 years...

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] and considering we're expected to spend 40% of our time in the office from October, this doesn't really help with the cost of travel

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] did some quick maths there, I'd only be £55 per month better off from where I am at now on the new offer considering travel costs from October. And that's with a Railcard discount on my train tix...

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 30 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I was born in Edinburgh and am being priced out of living here. if the SG could consider how its staff and workers are more than a temporary feature in our society and thus prioritise the enabling of helping its staff get on the property ladder then maybe such a stimulus would make even less of a monetary offer than what we are speaking of above actually way more beneficial and enticing to its staff. There is a new generation that are working full-time but are resigned to a hopeless situation with regards to the housing market. Doesn't help that every bit of land is apparently for sale to the highest bidder...

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 30 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] that is why many people I know moved out of the central belt to be able to afford a flat (not even a house), but they are now are hours away from their offices. This is why being pushed to go back to the office 2 days a week or even in the future 4 days is so shocking, as it isn't taking into account anything of this. Not my case but I could have easily been in that situation. Back 4 days will kill all the benefits we have from hybrid, and we will keep all the disadvantages, like carrying the computer on our shoulder and having meetings without space in between (it didn't happen on those 'good times' in the office). This is all very worrying.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

Doesn't look like much was negotiated! 😞

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

Keep in mind this is after their un-evidenced and un-costed grand ideas of us returning to the office. Given the financial impact this will have either due to travel, child care, etc this is ultimately asking us to take a real terms pay cut

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

Very disappointed in the 3 year offer when most others have a 2 year offer with an inflation clause. If they added in an inflation clause we would struggle to get agreement for industrial action, but without it we are left hanging in 2027-28, with a real prospect of inflation being nearer 3% than 2%. This is the worst offer being made in the Scottish public sector

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] The Pay table from 1 January 2025 is the existing scale, the updated tables for 1 April 2025 onwards are in the word document linked in the article.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

Sorted

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

Also to note that everyone on the B3 max (which will be a significant amount of SG staff) has now been bounced into the higher pension contribution of 7.25% vs the previous 5.45% - this kicked in at £56,000 - which essentially wipes out any payrise for probably a huge number of staff (me included!).

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] yep - quick calculation indicates full time B3 at max step in Alpha can enjoy a monthly take-home increase of around £40 in 25-26.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

does anyone know if the higher rate applies to all earnings or just earnings above the higher threshold?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] the 7.25% alpha pension employee contribution applies to all earnings.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] It's a hard switch applied to your entire pensionable pay unlike progressive PAYE bands.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

Income above £60,000 (so 1 April 27 for B3's) puts you into the High Income Child Benefit charge as well.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] £40 and then add in the new in person guidance and i'll be worse off!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] and that's not even starting to take into consideration the cost of travel with this 40% requirement for office attendance etc.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

I think there would be less income tax to pay as pension payments come off before tax?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] every cloud ☹️

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] but still paying a higher amount than rUK - comment downstream puts it at £1700 more per annum than our colleagues down south - it's starting to pinch!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I was under the impression the Scottish Government were meant to be the more progressive, sensitive and altruistic government. Or that's at least how we try and frame it, yet ultimately they want their staff paid less for the same job in England and consistently refuse to acknowledge the impact of or rise in inflation.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Not trying to defend the pay offer but SG staff get paid better than equivalent grades in UK gov

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] It says on the civil service pensions website its a progressive contribution? Contribution rates - Civil Service Pension Scheme

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Much better by the time you get to the max of the band. On some occasions 10K + better.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] reducing your hours by 40 minutes a week would take you back into the 5.45% range, which I believe mean you would get paid more than if you stayed full time.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] yes but as soon as you hit £56,001 your entire salary is pensioned at 7.35% - it's well known across the entire UKG that G7s/C1s and now SEOs/B3s have one year where their salaries dip because of the pension rise - but it was always just for G7s before. Perhaps time for the pensions to look at the pay scales!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25

I've always found that so unfair. Folk pay 7.35% pension contributions till they earn 150K yet lower paid staff have 3 huge incremental increases to deal with!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 28

I have a stupid question about the pension contributions. Obviously higher employee contributions means less coming into our bank account each month, but is that money in some sense still coming back to us in the form of the pension itself after we retire? I'm currently making (very small) voluntary contributions to my pension because I believe it's good value in the sense that the amount I get back after I retire is more than I put in now. Is this 7.35% similar to that, or does it just disappear with no benefit?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 28 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] the 7.35% you contribute, and the 28% the employer contributes simply pay for existing pensioners. You don't get any of this money back. The important figure to focus on is the accrual rate (2.32% for alpha), and then whatever supplement to that you achieve with one of the additional pension contribution routes available. It's absolutely worth putting in what you can afford to over the base accrued salary but the fixed contributions you or the employer make now make zero difference to the pension that will be available to you.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 28 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Thank you for explaining. I find that astounding! That means that the rates and bands for the pension contributions are some of the most important aspects of our overall pay, and they rarely get talked about. Especially the fact that the higher rate applies to all of your income and not just the portion above the threshold! 🤖 I wonder if the employer will receive lots of requests for B3s on the max band to go part time to 99%... Would that get around this?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 28 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] You can go part time to bring yourself under £56000 to avoid the cliff edge sure, but I personally would not find that to be sustainable after a couple of years of inflation.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 11 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] is that the case once you factor in income tax?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 1 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I think some people may take the choice to work less hours to avoid higher rates for things like tax and pensions. Fiscal drag and all that is a real problem. I don't know if pensions contributions have a fiscal drag too, or whether that will rise at some point. As [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] says, there is also the issue of inflation. Really, I paid £5.00 for a cup of coffee somewhere in the environs of Edinburgh the other month. I shan't be going to that particular cafe again. But these things are often very local and preference dependent. You can pay £8.00 for a pint of Guinness but if you don't mind drinking Deuchers IPA, at the right pub you can still pay £3.00 for a pint even in Edinburgh. And if you go to a bar in a small town you can still get a pint of something for £2.00! I don't want to give the impression I hang out in bars all the time - just examples of a well know commodity.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 1 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] But all this comes down to a question. What is the real value of any extra pound earned as part of a pay rise.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

There were more B3s than any other grade - 2,313 in 2024. Many will be on top of scale and will be subject to higher taxation that will wipe out any pay uplift.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] higher taxation and higher pension contribution!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] pretty much renders this 'offer' a bit pointless really.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I've always found that so unfair. Folk pay 7.35% pension contributions till they earn 150K yet lower paid staff have 3 huge incremental increases to deal with!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

They never take the tax differential between Scotland and the rUK into account. Already costs a B3 on their max £1,700 extra income tax per year.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] to be fair SG pay bands are higher than UKG bands (and by more than £2k)

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] It does depend what department, and sometimes they have other benefits we don't (a full year full pay maternity, electric vehicle salary sacrifice etc.) so it's not a straight up comparison.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Hi [Redacted S.38(1)(b)], yes on the surface that may appear to be the case but the bottom line is your take home pay. No point having "higher" banded pay if your take home is lower because of increased pension contributions and devolved higher tax rates.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] im not defending the pay deal, but to suggest we are 'harder done by' than UKG colleagues isnt fair.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Building a larger pension through increased contributions and paying more tax, allowing the less well off in society to benefit from the far better welfare state in Scotland do make a large difference. Again not defending the pay deal but have to agree with [Redacted S.38(1)(b)]. Also worth noting that council tax is considerably lower across Scotland as well (even with water included within those payments) so it is not a simple comparison.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] As former UKG I can confirm SG conditions, pension & pay are superior to majority of UK Civil service.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 29 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Comparisons are never simple. I live in [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] so we were punished with falling into band E after my partner bought it (D and above are considered wealthy people). This is also another unfair system that nobody wants to touch although they recognise it is unfair. But still, difficult to change something so sweet as the council tax bands.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 11 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] don't worry the SNP have a manifesto commitment from 2007 to scrap and replace council tax 🤔

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Oct 1 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I think you are correct. Although I don't think a direct link need be made to grades in the civil service. I think it is only necessary to say that a person on £X in Scotland pays more in tax than a person on £X in other parts of the UK. The fact that a B3 in Scotland earns more than their equivalent in the other parts of UK is neither here nor there, in my view. Tax and pay for CS isn't some sort of a package, but I agree that the effect of tax needs to be considered when looking at pay - for anyone working anywhere. It will be interesting to see what comes out of the autumn budget. I almost think the pay deal should wait for that, although on the other hand, getting it sooner would be welcome! To be clear, as a CS I'm not commenting on the SG's or the UK's approach to taxation. On a side note, I think I am right in saying that staff at the Scottish Parliament earn higher per grade than Scottish CS. I think it's about £2000 more per grade or something like that, but somebody correct me if I'm wrong on that one.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

From To £0 £34,799 (£34,199) 4.60% £34,800 (£34,200) £56,000 5.45% £56,001
£150,000 7.35% £150,001 - 8.05%

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Thank you for posting the table

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

It's ultimately very exhausting asking for a decent seat at the table, getting nothing but scraps and then being made to feel like it's all we're worth or, worse, we're being ungrateful for arguing our worth is beyond that. Can't help but feel the old adage of "When someone truly shows you how much/little they value you, believe them.". When it comes to how much we're valued by SSS/SG I can't help but feel their response is always 'The bare minimum'.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] It's a lot of PR and psychological mind games on a public stage (imo) - if we, and the public, are told time and time again that we are not valued as civil servants and not worthy of the bare minimum, eventually it starts to stick in the public psyche

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Absolutely, and what's so exhausting is how they don't even try and mask this contempt they evidently feel toward us for daring to ask, or push back on their rubbish offers/ideas that are clearly not based on hard evidence. They put so much effort in giving the PR appearance that this is a considerate place to work, where we are all valued and the hard work we do is truly appreciated, yet behind the digital posters it's a very different story.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

It would be useful to understand the full scope of the TU's concerns regarding the pay offer and whether this is simply limited to the value of the offer, or broader package. I appreciate the efforts of the TU's to secure the best deal possible. However, I am sure many people are frustrated about the timescales around these negotiations, particularly as costs continue to rise, but our pay does not. It is clear that yet again, pay negotiations will unlikely conclude until towards the end of the year, or perhaps into next year. I believe it would be preferable for many that the parts of the pay offer which the TU's are content with, plus the basic salary offering as set out by Mgt, are given to staff now. The remaining sticking points (such as final salary % award) could continue to be negotiated and agreed over the remainder of year. This would minimise the impact of negotiation delays. There is precedent for this. I appreciate this would cause additional burden on Pay colleagues (doing the pay update twice) - but that is nothing compared to the impact on those civil servants who are being disadvantaged by delays.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Hi [Redacted S.38(1)(b)]. Invitations for meetings to discuss pay offer and our strategy moving forward are being sent out

today. Members will have a chance to learn about the Union's side of the negotiations and Union reps will be able to ask how members wish to proceed. These meetings are only available to PCS members, as it our union dues and movement that advocates for the workers side during these negotiations. As a consequence of this, those not in the union will have no say, such is the nature of trade union membership.

mypcs.pcs.org.uk/onlinejoiningform Regarding the delays, PCS has long argued that pay progression should be contractual, and an employee's remuneration should automatically increase given their experience. However the employer insists on using it as leverage in pay negotiations. Our union cannot simply accept a pay offer that is below inflation predictions simply to speed the process along.

<https://mypcs.pcs.org.uk/onlinejoiningform>

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] My point is that a decision to reject the offer (rightly or wrongly) by a TU has negative impacts on the significant number of staff who are not part of the membership and those that are members alike. I believe everyone would benefit from an interim award while negotiations continue.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] you make a good point. I have experience from Local Government where the authority would pay out on the basis of their red line minimum on the proviso that any Union action upheld that resulted in an increased offer would be applied and backdated once agreed. It has its flaws in that some will say it weakens Union position but it puts the money in the hands of the employees when they are due to receive it not backdated in lump sums.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I agree with your point [Redacted S.38(1)(b)]. I massively appreciate the unions efforts to get a fair deal, but I think implementing an initial deal first (without union agreement) then implementing another one (with union agreement) would help bridge the gap a little bit for colleagues. I note this means implementing pay increases twice, which is duplication, but ideally negotiations should be completed on time and therefore only implemented once. The added pressure of wanting to avoid doing pay increases multiple times may be good! It feels like negotiations dragging on past the deadline is now the new normal.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 29 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] The unions (or certainly PCS) agree - it's the employer who refuses to do this.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 31 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] That is good to know thank you

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

This shareable redirect link [internal link] will allow SG and agency colleagues to access the pay award pages. You can find the shareable link on the top right corner of every Saltire page.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

Does "pay progression for colleagues on a pay step below the maximum for their pay range" apply each year or is it only 25/26?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Looks like each year, that is the benefit of a multi year deal and was the case for the last pay deal, where pay progression was automatic in April for the affected years

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] i've never known anything different happen. pay steps have always been automatic

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] If it's seemed automatic, it's because pay progression has been part of the pay deal agreed between the employer and the unions. It would be entirely possible for the employer to offer simply an increase in pay but no pay step progression at all for the period covered by the offer (as has been the case for our UKG colleagues for ages).

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)] thanks - Nail on the head [Redacted S.38(1)(b)], I used to work for UKG and I am not used to automatic pay step progression each year. Thanks to [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] & [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] for your reply as well.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I'll hop on this question and ask another related question, as I'm fairly new to SG, how does progression work with TP roles? Disregard, managed to find the policy on it

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 24

Should also be noted from the Comms that came out that the offer we have received is less than what was tabled on 3rd June to the Unions. So not only is it what it is, it has been reduced from an original offer as well. I also get what others say in that SG pay ranges are higher than bands in other areas of UKG - but that does not mean it is an acceptable offer. Staff leaving and not being replaced meaning heavier workloads for a lot of us. We do our best, we work longer hours than we probably should at times despite going down to a 7 hour day. But between how we are being perceived while working from home and demands for increased office attendance with no actual evidence of what it will prove to achieve, and now this pay award, all that staff are left feeling just now is disillusioned and as if we are not trusted or valued.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Do you have any details of the 3 June offer?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Hi [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] - no, its just what was said in the comms the Union sent out by email yesterday.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Thanks [Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25

Does the pay rise apply to someone at the max of the pay scale ?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Yes

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 25

For those interested in what the previous offer was the PCS Union comms said "It should also be noted that the offer on the table now is less than the offer which was tabled on 3 June. In our view, the lack of urgency and delays to progressing pay talks has been a deliberate tactic on behalf of Scottish Government to capitalise on the uncertainty members are feeling about the current economic conditions. Whilst that offer had the same pay metrics it also had a draft inflation re-opener clause (not as good as the other public sector deals), and included an increase in annual leave to 6 weeks after 2 years, slight increases to maternity and paternity leave, a commitment to further work on the shorter working week and, more importantly, a stronger commitment to no compulsory redundancies."

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 28

2 years to get your extra leave? Wow! Also i noticed that a pay step has again been removed from the A3 scale! In all honesty, I do not begrudge anyone this. However, where is the reward for experience or longevity of service? There is no value put on these things at all. Not everyone wants to or can apply for promotion/progression but that does not mean these staff should feel less valued. Experience is a very valuable commodity and often these are the staff that we depend on to "bring on" any new staff that join us. Some consideration for people who fall in to this category would be appreciated.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 28 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I had to wait nearly 10 years for my extra 5 days of leave!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 28

me too! it used to be 15 years so i suppose there is always an element of these things being reduced and winding up someone but 2 years seems really fast! If "they" are using leave as a carrot then maybe they should give a bit more at 5 year's service, then again at 10!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 28 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Agree entirely. This is what the Peter principle is about. A system that encourages people to believe that success is measured in promotion and notes that people tend to rise to the level of their incompetence. Promotion tends to recognise people who are good in the job they do and probably very valuable to the org rather than can they do the job at the next level. So

they are promoted to a level where they are uncomfortable, incompetent and generally unhappy. The result is that the organisation has lost two people - the one who no longer does the job they were really good at and the one now struggling in their new job. People should be recognised as being good at their job and rewarded for that, this means a true performance pay system where you don't have to be promoted to earn more salary rewards. This is far more positive for the organisation because it incentivises everyone and makes sure that we have good and capable people in all jobs. Granted though that it cannot be a never-ending spine. and there has to be a max. Competency based promotion interviews reinforce this, ie they are about how you did something not about how you would cope with the promoted post. They don't look at the potential to do a promoted level job. The old reporting system used to give a performance marking, ie how you did in your current role - and a promotion potential marking ie did you have legs to reach the next level. You were marked as Well fitted, Fitted or Not Fitted for promotion. You had to be marked fitted over a period of time to be able to go forward to a board. At the board you were asked a number of competency and theoretical questions. Currently we don't like asking questions to understand whether the individual has considered the theory of how to do the job and has the intellectual horsepower required at that level. I find this strange given that we recruit graduates on the basis of a degree most of which are entirely theoretical. A short pay spine may get people to the top of the spine quickly but what happens then, where is the incentive for those who are not going to be promoted? The fact is that even if everyone was capable and wanted promotion they can't be promoted because the hierarchy is a pyramid and there are less posts to be promoted into. So the question is how do we reward those people who are really good at their jobs but can't be promoted.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 31 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] i agree - we dont recognise long service at all - you dont even get a certificate or a thank you. im a whipper snapper at 16 years but i think we should recognise it some how

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 28

Considering the minimum leave entitlement for any full time job is 28 days, the 30 day (6 weeks max) is not a particularly large benefit anymore.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 28 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Can those 28 days include public holidays?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 28

Employers can choose, as SG has done, to count P&P days towards the 5.6 week statutory allowance.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 28 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Holiday entitlement: Entitlement - GOV.UK A couple of extracts ... Statutory annual leave entitlement Most workers who

work a 5-day week must receive at least 28 days' paid annual leave a year. This is the equivalent of 5.6 weeks of holiday. Bank holidays Bank or public holidays do not have to be given as paid leave. An employer can choose to include bank holidays as part of a worker's statutory annual leave. In SG annual leave and P&P holidays aren't included together so staff have a total of either 36.5 or 41.5 days of holiday entitlement.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 30

Can someone point me to where both SG and the Union are getting their projections about Inflation in 2025, 2026, 2027 from?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 30 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I'm not completely sure, but I expect that they're using figures from the OBR (here: Inflation - Office for Budget Responsibility)

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 30

That's what i found when i googled as well. If this held, that would be high of 3.7% in 2025, 2.6% in 2026, and 2.0% in 2027 - and i mean highs, not counting the troughs. The trouble is no one believes that, right? And legislating 2 years out that 2.0% inflation (the government's stated target) = a 2.0% pay rise feels like madness.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 30 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] There's nothing else to go on though. Forecasts almost always tend towards the 2% target after a few years, which I think is a reasonable presumption if they believe that their actions are the optimal path towards that target. I don't think there's any useful way to forecast shocks in this context.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 30

Worth mentioning, that other civil service bodies e.g. COSLA, have a trigger built into their pay deal meaning if inflation (i believe it's the Consumer price index) raises above the rate of inflation, it automatically triggers a review of the pay deal to ensure the pay deal isn't overtaken. No such clause for scotgov employees though!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 30

I agree - all the more reason why agreeing to 2% in 2 years time without a renegotiation clause is folly. The first two bits - 3.75% and 3.25% - while not great, are almost stomachable in the context of an Organisation that seems to be in permanent austerity with a hiring freeze etc, but the 2% in the third year is not something anyone can accept given the potential uncertainty in the world.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 31

While there may be a hiring freeze in relation to SG staff, it seems that hiring agency or contractor staff is anything but slowing down - if anything is has been increasing. Some may say this is ironically due to the fact that SG staff are not being recruited to replace staff having left and therefore agency staff are being recruited to cover roles. Yes some

may be short term, but I am sure a lot of us are aware that some agency staff have been around for up to the 23 months and some longer.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Jul 31

Have posted this on another comment, but it seems to be pretty deep so will re-post and hope it is easier to see. Wanted to make people aware of the fact we have been told we would work toward pay restoration against 2008 wages. Table one (picture one) shows you (if you are on the top of your band) how much you are down respective to where your wages should be if they had continued at the rate we were given in 2008. Table two (picture two) shows you where your wages would be with this new offer - only for the first increase being offered, 3.75%. Please note - this is against inflation to June 25 - given we are almost in August, it is nearly out of date so will change, and in fact by the time we make any decisions on this offer, it is likely that inflation will outstrip the offer.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 1

we [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] still haven't heard anything yet but this 2% would not be excepted by us

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 4

While any pay rise is welcome, it's important to consider this in the context of other recent public sector agreements made by the Scottish Government. For comparison: NHS staff have accepted an 8% increase over two years (4.25% in 2025/26 and 3.75% in 2026/27). Scottish Prison Service employees, also civil servants, received 8% over two years on the same terms. Local Government workers agreed to 7.5% over two years (4% in 2025/26 and 3.5% in 2026/27). The current offer of 9% over three years averages out to just 3% per year, which is notably lower than the annualised increases seen in the above settlements. Given inflationary pressures and the cost of living, a three-year deal at this level risks falling behind real-term pay expectations and may not reflect the value of the workforce or the precedent set by other sectors.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 20

So CPI is now at 3.8%, meaning the 3.75% offered by the SG to its civil servants is now lower than CPI. No inflationary increase any longer, whilst other public servants are getting at least 0.25% more. The 'offer' becomes less credible as time goes on. Combine that with a forced return to the office where many of us will see our costs rise, and this is a further erosion of our overall benefits package.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 27

Any further update regarding the pay award?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 28 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] - unions were holding a ballot about whether to accept or not. Think it closes this week.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 28 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] From PCS yesterday: This is a brief email to advise you of the outcome of the consultative pay ballot on the 2025 pay offer, which closed yesterday (26 August) at 12pm. Thank you to the Group Executive Committee members who volunteered their time after work yesterday to scrutinise the results to ensure we were able to communicate with members today. The results of the ballot are: Overall turnout: 78% Voted yes to reject pay offer: 91% Voted yes to take industrial action: 81% This is a huge result for our Group, and will send a resounding message to Scottish Government and Scottish Ministers about the pay offer published in July. Next steps for the process will involve: Pay negotiators have sent a formal dispute letter to the Permanent Secretary that indicates our strong mandate and intention of our members to take action in order to receive a fair pay offer in line with the rest of the public sector. The letter provided a time frame for response from the Permanent Secretary as to whether the employer intends to re-open pay talks. The Group Executive Committee will continue to work with branches to carry out essential data cleansing work to prepare for the possibility of industrial action should pay talks not re-open, or we do not receive a revised pay offer by the agreed deadline.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 28 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I wonder what the deadline was

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 28

Excellent ballot result. That sends a strong message that will hopefully be noticed.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)], Aug 28

Thanks everyone for your insight, that's really appreciated! 😊 👍

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Sep 29

Hey! Hoping for some help and might sound like a daft Question but I have just been reviewing the Sep Payroll report and noticed that the SCS have had their pay awards implemented this month. Is there a report that reflects their new salary so I'm able to forecast accurately? I'm unable to forecast accurately just now as I know that the Sep costs are over inflated due to their pay being backdated from April. Any help is greatly appreciated as always :)

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Sep 29

The SCS pay ranges with effect from 1 April 2025 are on Saltire Senior Civil Service (SCS) pay

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 1

That's perfect and thank you for the help [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] 😊

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 2

When will our pay award will be agreed and implemented?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 28

Hello! I am not sure where to ask this so giving it a go here :). In terms of pay progression, at what point do you move a band, ie from Max-1 to Max for example? I thought it was at the start of the financial year, but looking at my payslip I am still in the same bracket as I was last year.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 28

I think it is dependant upon the pay deal being agreed and when you started in post, there is some details explaining the pay progression on Saltire, but as we're into the new pay year that's subject to the current pay deal negotiations, as of right now I think the answer is "Depends on what happens." Happy to be corrected though!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 28

Normally the step increment is processed at the same time as the agreed increase for the Pay deal.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 28

Pay progression is dependent on the next pay deal, which as far as I know is still being negotiated. But historic precedence is that any agreed deal including pay progression is typically then backdated to apply from the start of the financial year when it gets implemented (so, for example, if it worked that way again the pay rise might come in around October's pay but your October pay would also have the backdated April through September pay-progression amount as well if you were eligible to go up a step).

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 28 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Yeah, that's what HR advised me when I queried it - I'm due to go up a band but it won't happen until the new pay award is agreed and in place 😞

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 28

I see a few others have responded with the main info on it but also worth noting the saltire performance review guidance also notes a 'not effective' performance marking may affect pay and you should refer to the terms of the relevant pay award applying at the time to establish how your marking may affect your pay. See the saltire source for this [internal link]

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 28 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] - we need to wait until the new pay award - the last negotiation gave incremental increases from April 2023 until Jan 2025 - but sadly it doesn't automatically go to the next band now until they have something newly agreed in place. One year, I think in 2022, that didn't happen until the November, when it was backdated to the April - hopefully that won't be the same this year and it can happen quickly.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 28

I recall if you started before 5th December then you would be due to move up to the next band on the pay scale for your grade the following April, however if you started after the 5th it would be the year after that e.g. if you started on 4th December 2024 then you would move up (subject to meeting performance indicators etc) on 1st April 2025 (but not implemented until pay award agreed and then it would be backdated to 1st April), however if you started in SG on 6th December 2024 then you wouldn't move up until 1st April 2026. Might be worth contacting HR though to establish when the cut off is!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 28 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Did you see this recently? I thought it used to be that you had to have started in October (which is frustrating because I moved Band on November 24).

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 28 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] scroll most of the way down and the key date was 2 December in the last deal). Pay ranges and pay award Hoping for the same this time as I also moved up in November!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 29 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] no sorry, I remember this from when I started back in 2018. I started in September but my husband started later in December of the same year. We were confused when I moved up from the following April but he didn't and queried it and found this out. I appreciate there needs to be a cut off somewhere but this could also be explained better when you start in SG - I had wrongly just assumed it was when I hit 1 year e.g. the following September that I went up to the next step - does feel a bit unfair that some people could have been in the organisation for only 6 months and others have to wait over a year for the increase.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 28

Like others have said, its dependant on this years pay award as pay progression is linked to the award.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 28

Thank you all :) I will wait until the new pay award is agreed and hope for a juicy paycheck in back payments :)

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 28

Hopefully a multi-year award will be agreed - the current SG public sector pay policy encourages this. If this happens, this means pay awards would happen in April without delay (as it did last year) for the duration of the next agreement.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 29

Yes and no from me on that one. The clarity, ability to budget and the pay actually coming in on agreed dates was good, but agreeing way in advance what the pay rise

would be when inflation is so volatile and ended up being much higher than the 2024/2025 pay rise, wasn't so clever in retrospect, i think.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 29

PCS and other unions have long-argued that the pay progression should be guaranteed as a contractual benefit, however our employer continues to argue that pay progression is conditional on reaching an agreement in pay negotiations. As others have said, until we have clarity about what the final offer is from Scottish Ministers the unions won't be able to put an offer to their respective memberships.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 29

The working proposal from the Govt is 9% over 3 years i believe - 3% each year

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 30

is it not on the anniversary of your appointment?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 30

I am having the same question as well. I thought this month my pay should have gone up to a higher band but it didn't.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 30

maybe contact HR and they will be able to answer your query

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 30

You move increment the pay day after each annual anniversary of when you started - until you reach maximum increment.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 30

To see my post from yesterday - contains relevant links to Saltire guidance on pay discussion process, including pay progression. [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] on Viva Engage: We have feedback that there are a number of iFix queries being raised in relation to pay award and progression and when this may be reflected in pay s... Posted in All Company on Apr 29, 2025

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 30

Thanks All - i think everything has been answered so will close this convo :)

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6

I'm actually devastated as I am due on [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Do you think there is any wiggle room on this if we campaigned? Family Friendly Leave/Pay 35. With effect from 1 April 2026 the following changes to family leave and pay will take effect where the expected date of birth is on or after this date. • Maternity – Contractual Maternity Pay at the rate of half-pay will be paid for weeks 28 to 39 of the maternity leave period. This means that the full 39-week statutory maternity pay period will benefit from enhanced contractual payment. This will also apply to Adoption leave/pay, and Shared Parental leave/pay. • Paternity – entitlement to paternity leave at full pay will increase to 5 weeks.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6

I'm due [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I'm disappointed to read that I will miss out on this new pay benefit.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I'm now angry as if the pay deal had been announce on the 1st April 2025 I would planned my family accordingly

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6

I feel particularly aggrieved as if the policy had been announced in April 2025 I would have waiting [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] to try and would have qualified.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6

I'm due in [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] and disappointed to be missing out.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] just don't see why it can't be that anyone who is on maternity from 1st april gets the pay rise!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6

I would suggest speaking to your unions as it's a fair point that if the pay deal terms had been announced on time, employees could have made different decisions around family planning. I'm in the position where my due date is [Redacted S.38(1)(b)], but the current wording of the offer disqualifies me anyway. I will be raising this with my union rep.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I have already raised it with my union rep, but I feel like we will need a sustained bit of pressure to get anything done about this. There could be children born before my child that will qualify for this because of the 1st April due date requirement. I don't understand why it can't just be applied from the 1st april, so anyone who is in any of the weeks from 28-39 automatically gets the 1/2 pay.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6

Absolutely [Redacted S.38(1)(b)], I'm happy to be part of any ongoing campaign to have this reconsidered. That's a fair point too about April-due bubs arriving early, I hadn't considered that. A pro-rated release has to be the fairest way to address the issue and prevent parents being on leave at the same time on different pay conditions.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] also happy to join any sort of campaign re this

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Thanks [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] - have you emailed your union rep if you are in one? That's step 1 for sure.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Hi [Redacted S.38(1)(b)], likewise I would like to see if anything can be done so that those on maternity leave from 1st April can benefit too (I'm

due November 2025). I am not part of a union but have just filled out a form to join FDA and will write to the rep as soon as I am on their system.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] great news you have joined the Union. I think the key things to ask for is the policy to be instituted pro-rata - so that from the 1st April 2026 half pay is applied, regardless of what week in the 28-39 you fall in. This is an issue of fairness so that two sets of parents aren't on parental leave under two different sets of terms and conditions at once.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Agreed! Fingers crossed it is something that will be looked at it again. I'll speak to other colleagues who I know are due to go on mat leave and will miss out under the current offer.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6

I am due [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] and also extremely disappointed. I have emailed the union rep for advice and to have an understanding why 1 April 2026 date was selected as it is going to create a two tier system of people, one lot who are significantly disadvantaged over the other but who are both on maternity leave at the same time.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Well done for emailing [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] - thank you!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6

I too am [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] and was disappointed to see that the new rate will no apply to my maternity leave especially as the weeks effected would fall after April 2026 despite starting maternity in December

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Hi [Redacted S.38(1)(b)], are you in a union?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6

I have also emailed the union rep for advice. Really disappointing to hear the new deal won't start until April 2026. [Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] thanks for emailing [Redacted S.38(1)(b)]. The more people that email the better.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6

I also was so disappointed to read the above - [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] and got excited thinking I will be able to benefit from this rather than relying on SMT. The financial cost is a huge difference and I feel absolutely gutted to be missing out from it. Could someone send me a link to signing up to the FDA? It's obviously great for people going forward but extremely frustrating for people like ourselves who are either due before this date in April. :(

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] - I just clicked "join today" Union for Civil Servants & Public Sector Professionals | The FDA Trade Union. I feel the same - so pleased at such a great policy, just gutted I won't benefit from it despite being on mat leave at the time...

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6

Is it the FDA union or PCS union people have joined?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] for B2 and above it's FDA. I'm a B3 and in PCS, but I have not been impressed how they have handled a few things so considering jumping to FDA

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I have recently left PCS and have now joined FDA, have heard good things about it from colleagues although it is a bit more expensive.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] mine is working out cheaper to join FDA but that's because I'm still a B3.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6

Just to say I have emailed FDA with my concerns in the meantime anyway, but they have indicated there is no scope to alter the terms of the deal. Still probably worth writing to unions, but not feeling particularly hopeful about it.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] argh no! I think we need to be clear we will be voting No, and also that it says IN THE DEAL that family pay can be reviewed.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Very good point!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I'm keen to email PCS about this too (I'm due [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] so am similarly disheartened about the timing) but I'm trying to find where it says in the deal that family pay can be reviewed, can you please share this part?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Hi [Redacted S.38(1)(b)], it was point 40. Good news you are emailing. 40.The improvements to family leave set out in this pay offer are in addition to other improvements that have been made recently outwith pay negotiations including the introduction of paid leave for foster and kinship care as well as an increase in paid leave for Carers. Scottish Government and the trade unions have agreed to continue to take forward discussions over the period of this pay award on other potential improvements or changes to the current arrangements including any changes that might be necessary in line with the provisions of the forthcoming Employment Rights Act.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7

I'm on maternity leave now as my baby was born [Redacted S.38(1)(b)]. My SMP period starts [Redacted S.38(1)(b)]. I am particularly upset as it is a lot of money (albeit we weren't entitled to before hand!) to lose out on. I've also contacted the Union to ask if there is scope to move on it, for example to apply to those who will be on SMP period on or after 1 April and not just births. Also not feeling particularly hopeful but felt I had to say something.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Congrats [Redacted S.38(1)(b)]! I have specifically asked for it to be applied to ANYONE who has any of the SMP weeks fall after 1st April 2026 - hoping we can get it implemented.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7

I wanted to share a response I received from FDA regarding the enhanced family leave pay policy. They confirmed that unions did raise concerns about the 1 April 2026 cut-off

date, but the employer cited technical constraints (Oracle systems) and insisted that any cut-off would inevitably create disparity. FDA also noted that the employer views this as a lawful policy change, not discriminatory. However, I think it's important to clarify that the issue isn't just about having a cut-off date—it's about how that cut-off is applied (i.e. that it's basis is not a financial/pay year but child's age). Under the current proposal, two colleagues could both be on maternity leave in April 2026, but be treated completely differently: Colleague A gives birth on 30 March 2026 and starts maternity leave in early March. Her weeks 28 to 39 fall after 1 April, but she will not receive enhanced pay. Colleague B gives birth on 2 April 2026 and starts maternity leave in early April. Her weeks 28 to 39 also fall after 1 April, and she will receive enhanced pay. Both are on leave at the same time, in the same financial year, doing the same thing - but under two different sets of terms and conditions, purely because of their child's date of birth. Not entirely sure how this aligns with fairness and equality, and whether this is potentially indirect age discrimination under the Equality Act 2010, since the child's age is the determining factor for the parent's entitlement. The policy does not differentiate based on the timing of leave or the financial year, but solely on the child's birth date. A fairer approach would be to apply the enhanced pay to anyone on maternity, adoption, or shared parental leave from 1 April 2026 onwards, regardless of their child's age or due date. Thanks to everyone who's already raised this with unions and HR. It's clear from the discussion here that many colleagues feel strongly about this.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Thank you - I received a similar response from FDA. Just to add, I think the cut-off date treats employees differently depending on the expected date of birth of the child, not the actual birth date (unless that is a mistake - but FDA did not seem to think it is). As I think someone highlighted earlier in the chain, you could actually have a situation where employee A's child is born on 31st March (but with an expected due date of 1 April) who will be caught by the policy, and employee B's child is born on 1 April (but with an expected due date of 31 March) who doesn't appear to be caught by the policy. Whilst that doesn't affect me personally (I am due in [Redacted S.38(1)(b)]), I would be particularly aggrieved if I was in that position, given due dates can be a very rough guess. And of course, the reason behind this is oracle...

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Thanks for raising that point. it's a really important nuance. But even so, I think the underlying issue remains the same: the basis for different treatment is still the age of the child, whether it's expected or actual. That means the policy creates a situation where colleagues on maternity or shared parental leave at the same time, in the same financial year, are treated differently purely because of their child's age. This raises a serious question about fairness and equality, and potentially about indirect age discrimination under the Equality Act 2010. In this case, the

employer has chosen to link entitlement to the expected date of birth, rather than the timing of leave or the financial year. That decision results in a two-tier system, where some parents receive enhanced pay and others do not, even though they are on leave during the same period. A more equitable approach would be to apply the enhanced pay to anyone on maternity, adoption, or shared parental leave from 1 April 2026 onwards, regardless of their child's age or due date. That would align the policy with the financial year and ensure consistent treatment for all colleagues on leave during that time.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] yes by using the expected due date, someone could have (and I really hope not!) an extremely premature baby that would be entitled to this pay long before any other child. Have you gone back to FDA with your points? Still heard nothing from PCS but no surprises there.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Agree completely - I will make that point to FDA too - thanks!!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Thanks for your message. I'm not an FDA member, but I approached them to understand whether they had challenged this issue and how. Their response was disappointing and has made me very hesitant to ever consider joining. They acknowledged the problem but essentially accepted the employer's justification around Oracle system constraints and the inevitability of a cut-off date. But as we've discussed here, the issue isn't just about having a cut-off—it's about how that cut-off is applied and that it's basis is ultimately the child's age whether you call it actual or expected date. For those who feel strongly about this, I'd also highlight that there is a formal grievance process available to staff in the Scottish Government. It can be used to raise concerns about terms and conditions, discrimination, or unfair treatment. Raising this through the grievance route may be an effective way to ensure the employer is formally made aware of the impact and perceived unfairness of the policy. You can find the grievance policy and procedure here: [Grievance policy](#)

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7

Just to say that the Grievance notification template on Saltire that the guidance asks to complete is not working. But tickets can be raised via ifix here, in case anyone is interested: [iFix Portal - Grievance and mediation](#) There's a mandatory field in the form asking "Who does your query relate to?" but you can scroll down and select one of the neutral options at the end (i.e. ZZ Mailbox Reader).

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7

It is extremely disappointing that an organisation who states that it is an equal opportunities employer has created a policy which does not encourage/apply equality between employees. I find the Oracle point even more damning, a technicality rather than taking an equal approach to all employees. I have not received a response from PCS yet.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] The oracle point doesn't wash for me because you will still be processing two different types of payment at the same time!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7

Just wanted to sympathise - I also thought it was really unfair that it doesn't just come into affect for all eligible people on 1st April. Feels particularly harsh that if you are on Mat leave but not yet at those weeks that you wouldn't get the new policy which has come into affect. I understand they can't back date it but if you aren't at the end of your paid leave on April 1st, surely you should get this.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7

I've written to FDA now too - I came back from mat leave earlier this year (couldn't afford to take any stat pay) and even I'm annoyed about missing out on this pay offer, so I can't even imagine how people must feel who are actually off over that period and not able to access this!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7

I also wholeheartedly agree with the points made above. Using due dates as the criteria really seems incredibly unfair, especially given it is recognised that due dates are an estimate and rarely accord with when your baby is actually born. It seems ridiculous that you could have one child due on 31 March and one due on 1 April and both mother's will be on maternity leave over the same period but one will receive the half pay and the other wont (and when the child due on 31 March could come later and the child due on 1 April could come earlier). Equally I wouldn't support the cut off being when your child is actually born as again that could lead to unfairness but also cause unnecessary stress at what is already an incredibly stressful time when you may be needing to make decisions about induction etc. It should be for anyone on leave after 1

April 2025 to align with this being part of the 2025-2026 pay award. However, if not that surely it should just be if you are on parental leave after 1 April and that period of leave falls in weeks 28-39 (or partly) then you will qualify for the new policy (I am typing this very quickly and so if there is another scenario I have missed that means this results in unfairness then please shout!). I am also happy to contact my FDA rep to flag this. Separately, whilst the 5 weeks paternity leave on full pay is a welcome improvement I want to query the justification for only increasing this by a week. At the very least I think it should be 6 weeks given this is when nhs usually "clear" mothers after giving birth (although we will all know it takes a lot longer than that). I also assume that using the due date as the cut off could also mean there are fathers who miss out on that precious extra week of leave simply because of this arbitrary date.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7

I've now had an answer from Prospect about the new family leave pay proposals. They explained that the 1 April 2026 implementation date is linked to the anniversary date used in the collective pay agreement, and that any improvement to terms and conditions will inevitably mean some people are treated differently depending on their circumstances at that date. They also said that the Scottish Government views this as a "proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim" under the Equality Act 2010. While that sets out the employer's position, I think these arguments are quite weak. The concern many of us have raised isn't about having a cut-off date at all — it's about how that cut-off is applied. By linking entitlement to the expected date of birth, the policy means that two employees could be on maternity, adoption or shared parental leave at the same time but receive different pay purely because of their child's expected age. That's not a financial or administrative necessity; it's a design choice that creates inequality within the same pay year. Prospect also stated that bringing a claim of age discrimination "against a comparator who has not yet been born" would be legalistically difficult. But I find it legally weak and misleading. The comparison under the Equality Act is between employees, not children. The child's expected birth date simply acts as a proxy for age, which is what introduces

a potential indirect age-related disadvantage. I've encouraged Prospect to revisit this issue and put forward stronger equality-based arguments in future discussions with the employer, since some of the arguments they've put forward don't seem to stand up to closer scrutiny. But I don't expect they'll take any further action on this topic. Based on the email I received, my personal view is that they accepted the employer's arguments without question.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 7

I missed out on Pat pay in 2022 by three weeks or so, and fought it for half a year but got nothing. I imagine they'll hold a hard, unfair, meaningless line.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 8

Heard back from PCS and feeling really despondent - in solidarity? I don't think so. You've raised really important points about the impact of cut-off date for the enhanced mat leave entitlement. We raised similar points in negotiations with the employer and pushed for them to implement from 1 April 2025 but they would not agree to this amendment. Where cut-offs or qualification dates are applied, there will always be staff who benefit and others who are disadvantaged; SG acknowledged this but wouldn't make the change. I agree that a much fairer approach would be to extend entitlement to anyone taking paid family leave from 1 April 2026 (or earlier) rather than making due date (or placement date in the case of adoption leave) the sole criteria. Whilst there is no scope for us to re-open negotiations with SG on this or any other aspect of the pay offer at this stage, we want members to make an informed decision before deciding on whether to accept or reject the offer. If the pay offer is rejected by members, then this will be one of the elements that we would seek to re-negotiate. The only thing we can do is urge our colleagues to reject the pay deal, but they won't because the unions haven't even flagged in their central communications that this is an issue and no one who is not pregnant, or expecting a child or looking to start a family or adopt will look at that section at all. We're completely stacked against it.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 8 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] It's really disappointing that the unions haven't flagged this issue more prominently in their central communications, especially given how clearly it touches on diversity and equality. Treating employees differently within the same financial year, under the same collective agreement, based solely on their child's age (or expected birth date as a proxy) is not just a technical detail but an equality issue. PCS told me I should join the union if I want to have a say in the pay offer. But from what I've seen, it doesn't feel like expecting parents had or will have much of a say at all

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 8

I raised this point at the most recent PCS branch call yesterday. My wife is currently on mat leave (works for SG) and will be going down to stat pay over the next few months, but if this was implemented when it should have been i.e April 25 we would have qualified. The Union have said that they will raise this again but like many on this thread i am not hopeful of any sort of backdated/change. Really is disappointing that it

has taken so long to get agreement that many staff members will miss out on 11 weeks full pay just for when they decided to start a family.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 9 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] It is really frustrating. Correct me if I am wrong, but the new policy includes half pay during weeks 28-39 (following 27 weeks of full pay) rather than full pay? Then of course the extra week's full pay for paternity leave.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 9

Had a really good conversation with PCS this evening - they will be writing to all of us who have written to them. They are in our corner, and they are going to support us but hands are tied on the reopening the pay deal specifically - but look forward to hearing what they have to say.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 10

I'm trying to quantify the effect of half pay compared to statutory pay for 11 weeks. Does anyone know if pension contributions are paid when on statutory pay, and whether statutory pay is taxed/liable for NI?

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 10 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] i believe it subject to both tax and NI contributions

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 10 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I think it's 12 weeks, not 11? And yes, pension contributions continue. During these 12 weeks period you're on what's called "assumed pensionable pay", so your pension builds up as if you were on your normal pay. This only applies to your main scheme contributions — not to Additional Pension Contributions (APCs)

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 16

Morning all. Has anyone been able to establish the SG rationale for using due date as the trigger for qualifying for the enhanced parental leave policy? If their intention was for anyone who has a child after 1st April next year to qualify then, as we know, the policy doesn't achieve this given a baby due in March could be born on or after 1st April. A huge part of my frustration is not being able to understand the logic in how the policy is being applied. The communication I have had with FDA has simply confirmed that the discussions on parental leave were lengthy and that they did challenge SG on the

implementation date but that SG were firm that they would not budge on the proposal. FDA also noted that SG cited technical constraints linked to Oracle systems making earlier implementation not possible (which of course is an incredibly frustrating reason - pay can be backdated and further the ask isn't to backdate but rather anyone who has their qualifying weeks on or after 1st April to receive the benefit).

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 16 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Yes, exactly - that's the confusing part. Even if 1 April 2026 stays as the start date, it's unclear why the cut-off is based on a pregnancy-related factor (the due date) rather than when someone is actually on leave. The issue isn't really when the change starts but how it's applied - linking it to the expected birth date creates inconsistency and unfairness that could easily be avoided with a simple, leave-based approach.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 20 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] I haven't had anything on this. Just the group email PCS sent to members who had been in touch but it didn't really answer the questions I had asked. I have asked PCS to advise on what happens if the pay deal is accepted/ will PCS support in members raising grievances if they choose to do that if the policy is adopted. PCS previously said they were considering seeking legal advice from their reps and I have asked if they have and if that will be shared.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 17

I feel exactly the same and resonate so much with this post, im due [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] and feel for the sake of [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] we will miss on a beneficial policy coming in to place, which should have been agreed for April 2025. I understand someone will always miss out but in this case it shouldn't be those who should have been entitled to this from April 2025!!

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Oct 21 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] we have a small whataspp group of us who are impacted by the proposed change if you would like to join? We have been discussing our options and looking at how we can approach this as one group rather than everyone individually. If you message me on teams i can add you if you would like to join

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

1h ago [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Hi [Redacted S.38(1)(b)], could I please join too? I am due on [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] and might miss out on the increased maternity pay/leave by just a few days. I will message you on Teams :)

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Thu at 2:52 PM

What started me down this journey was the suggestion that technology is the problem. When developing solutions you have to leverage People, Processes and Technology and where one is deficient, you either make steps to improve it, or you make up for it in the other areas. A comment that the technology isn't going to allow this is completely inappropriate to me, because if I was ever to give that response into developing a solution I shouldn't have a job. Ultimately I think the reason it annoys me so much is that it feels like a cover for other excuses and it shows how the issue is prioritised on it's lack of perceived value. I've no idea of the numbers of people this will effect, but I'd assume low hundreds (if not tens of people) and it annoys me that such a flippant excuse was given when ultimately flexi balance could be added to manually and wages could be delivered by hand (possibly being slightly hyperbolic there 😊). Unfortunately it also seems like the low numbers might also be a reason they're fine to just ignore it - we all won't be here forever and it will be a long gone forgotten about issue past the 1st April 2026. I was prepared to accept this at face value when both my wife and I work for SG (you win some, you loose some) but the combination of lack of foresight into how this actually effects people and, what I recognise now as, direct age discrimination that have got me flipping the other way. I hear that some people that will be effected by this might have already voted yes to the proposal because the subtleties of the arrangement aren't entirely obvious. While I'm not part of a union (currently...) I can sympathise because it's frustratingly what happened to me.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

May 6

Pay updates?

Hi everyone, I was just wondering if anyone had any idea when we might receive any updates regarding the ongoing pay negotiations? I, like many of us, was due to move up to the next band on the pay scale so I'm keen to try and keep up with any news that I have have missed. Thanks

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

May 6 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] see my recent post on this ... [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] on Viva Engage: We have feedback that there are a number of iFix queries being raised in

relation to pay award and progression and when this may be reflected in pay slips.

Posted in All Company on Apr 29, 2025

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 29

We have feedback that there are a number of iFix queries being raised in relation to pay award and progression and when this may be reflected in pay slips. Please see this link to a News in Brief article from 31 March which in turn links to information on the pay negotiation process and pay progression.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

May 7

Me too, no update from article shared on Saltire, as yet.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

May 7 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] the Saltire guidance gives detail on the pay negotiation process and pay progression.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

May 7

Thanks [Redacted S.38(1)(b)], saw that, so we are waiting now to see outcome.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 29

We have feedback that there are a number of iFix queries being raised in relation to pay award and progression and when this may be reflected in pay slips. Please see this link to a News in Brief article from 31 March which in turn links to information on Saltire which details more on the pay negotiation process, and includes information on pay progression. If you have submitted an iFix which is covered by this information it would be helpful to HR Shared Service colleagues if you are able to withdraw your query.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 29

Can this also be made available for agency staff to view as it is not available on the Transport Scotland Saltire page

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 29 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] - thanks for this feedback. A quick tutorial from Saltire colleagues and I've edited the Saltire link. Can you see if this works for you now.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

Apr 29

That works. Thanks [Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

May 1 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] link doesn't work for me.

[Redacted S.38(1)(b)]

May 1 [Redacted S.38(1)(b)] Hi - I can see you work in Social Security Scotland and your comms team have asked for the News in Brief article not to be shared on your agency's Saltire site. The pay negotiation process link should work for you however?